

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-10 and 12-21 remain in the application, all of which stand rejected.
Claims 1 and 11 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Claim 2 has been amended to correct a minor antecedent basis problem. The amendment does not introduce new matter.

1. Rejection of Claims 20 and 21 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau et al. (US 6,111,561; hereinafter "Brandau") in view of Organ et al. (US 7,047,463 B1; hereinafter "Organ").

With respect to claim 20, the Examiner asserts that, "Organ discloses displaying a test flow map structure which relates to a flow of tests for testing at least one device (Figure 5A and column 2, lines 8-12)." See, 2/20/2009 Office Action, p. 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Organ shows a test flow in diagrammatic form in Figure 5A, Organ does not indicate that the test flow diagram is (or should be) displayed. Rather, Organ merely provides a graphical illustration of an exemplary test flow, so that a reader of Organ's disclosure can visualize how a system automatically and recursively walks through a plurality of testing operations in a test flow. Nowhere does Organ indicate that a system displays the test flow of Figure 5A. Thus, neither Brandau nor Organ indicate that a test flow map structure displayed, or that a user might have a need to (or want to) perform a pan or zoom operation with respect to a test flow map structure. With none of the references teaching this, the combined teachings of Brandau and Organ do not teach every element of claim 20, and claim 20 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 21 is believed to be allowable for reasons similar to why claim 20 is believed to be allowable.

2. Rejection of Claims 3-10 and 12-19 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3-10 and 12-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau et al. (US 6,111,561; hereinafter "Brandau") in view of Organ et al. (US 7,047,463 B1; hereinafter "Organ") and Wood et al. (US 2004/0006425 A1; hereinafter "Wood").

Claims 3-10 and 12-19 are believed to be allowable, at least, because each of these claims depends from claim 20 or 21, and because Wood does not disclose the test flow map structure that is missing from Brandau and Organ.

3. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau et al. (US 6,111,561; hereinafter "Brandau") in view of Organ et al. (US 7,047,463 B1; hereinafter "Organ"), Wood et al. (US 2004/0006425 A1; hereinafter "Wood") and Chong et al. (US 2003/0142117 A1; hereinafter "Chong").

Claim 2 is believed to be allowable, at least, because it depends from claim 20, and because Wood does not disclose the test flow map structure that is missing from Brandau, Organ and Wood.

4. Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks provided herein, applicant respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & HART, LLP

By: /Gregory W. Osterloth/
Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 295-8205